

FLM
2015
054342

~~E~~
73
59

The Philippine Problem
By

Clark, Wm. Champ

1908



Class 237

Book 074

J. R. Jones 25.000
S. F. R

The Philippine Problem.

658
784

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHAMP CLARK,
OF MISSOURI.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 5, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 7941) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri said:

Mr. SPEAKER: A correspondent of the London Times once wrote to that paper stating that he sent it a long letter because he did not have time enough to prepare a short one. That was a very philosophic remark. I, perhaps, will speak longer to-day than if I had had time to prepare a speech on the Philippine question, to which I propose to devote myself exclusively. And in order that there may be no question whatever about what I think upon this subject, I propose to begin with a few plain propositions which I intend to discuss.

A man does not have to be an idiot in order to be a patriot.

A man is not a traitor because he is opposed to doing those things which jeopardize the existence of this Republic.

An American is not a pessimist because he is unwilling to see his country adopt as a settled policy the political principles of Alexander, Caesar, or Napoleon.

In the hands of political jobbers the American flag, like the mantle of charity, will be made to cover a multitude of sins. I do not care a bawbee about Aguinaldo or the Filipinos. My sympathy, my heart, my solicitude, go to the American people. I think more, far more, of the liberties of my children than of all the trade of all the earth. I would like to leave them both rich and free, but of the two I would infinitely prefer to leave them free—free to labor, free to work out their own career, free to sympathize with and help all people everywhere, struggling for liberty. I would not give the life of one healthy, honest, moral, patriotic, ambitious American white boy in exchange for all the Filipinos [applause] now in the archipelago or who will be there until the great judgment day. Believing firmly—and I will answer your question, my good friend—

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Thank you.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Believing firmly that the annexation of the Philippines, either forcibly or with the consent of the people of those islands, will in the end prove dangerous, if not ruinous, to our "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," I am dead against it now, henceforth, and forever. I would be against annexing them if every man, woman, and child in the Philippine Islands were beseeching us to annex them.

But the time is coming, and it is coming rapidly, when we must adopt a settled policy that we are willing to stand or to fall by.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it looks as if we had the Philippine Islands in theory. We have them not in fact. It was first said that we had them by conquest; but the President gives up that proposition, if he ever held it. Judge Day, who was at the head of the Peace Commission, says: "If we have any claim over there, it is a right by purchase and not by conquest." Now, what are we doing? I invite your attention, and, if need be, your questions, because, as this is not a written, cast-iron, prepared speech, it admits of elasticity; and I am not sure but what we shall arrive at the truth a great deal sooner by questioning each other than by making set speeches.

Section 10 of the treaty of Paris provides—

That the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress.

Nearly fourteen months have gone to join the years before the flood since that treaty was signed—to-morrow will be the anniversary of its ratification by the



Senate—yet Congress has done nothing, absolutely nothing, has not even attempted to do anything, toward carrying out that provision of the treaty to “determine the political status of the inhabitants of those far-away and unhappy islanders.”

The status of the Philippines and the rights of Americans are left, like Mohammed's coffin, suspended between heaven and earth.

After that treaty was ratified by the Senate, imitating the example of the man who locked the barn after the horse was gone, that body passed a resolution by way of construing the treaty, in which it declares “that by the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States.”

Now, the primary question is—and I wish you to listen to it—Does Congress intend to abdicate its functions or not? That is what we have done so far. In the last Congress we frequently inquired what was the policy of the White House, what the policy of the Republican party was. No man on that side of the Chamber ever undertook to say what it was; he would say what his own theory was. But I wish to repeat that question: Does Congress intend to legislate under the tenth section of the treaty of Paris, as it is in duty bound to do, or does it intend to abdicate its constitutional function and permit the President to run things ad libitum in the Philippines by means of a military satrapy? Judging the future by the past, all that Congress is expected to do in this matter of such far-reaching consequence to the American people is to furnish the money to carry on the government by satraps and to keep up a war which Congress never authorized and which Congress and Congress alone had the constitutional power to authorize. How long is this extraordinary state of affairs to continue? Is it to be continued only till after the election in order to give Republicans a chance to repudiate any particular policy and to advocate the one which appears to be most popular, or is it, like Tennyson's brook, to go on forever?

These questions are not asked for amusement or aggravation, but because the people of America have a right to the information.

Indeed, on several occasions when, in the other end of the Capitol, gentlemen have offered resolutions of inquiry, the resolutions have been tabled and the patriotism of the authors impugned.

In the days of reconstruction Congress usurped executive functions until the office of the President of the United States was reduced almost to a nullity. Now the President of the United States usurps Congressional and legislative function until Congress has fallen to the low estate of being merely an animated cash register for the executive department of this Government. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Which do you like the best?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not like either one. I like for the executive department to attend strictly to its own business, for the legislative department to attend to its business strictly, and for the judicial department to attend to its business strictly, and not undertake to run the politics of this country by issuing an injunction at every full or change of the moon. [Laughter.]

There was a day when the rescripts of the Roman emperors were supposed to be of binding effect throughout their vast domain. It really appears that we are fast sinking to a position when the wish of the President and not the Constitution is the supreme law of the land.

The Spanish war, which Congress declared, really ended in July, 1898; technically it ended with the ratification of the treaty of Paris.

The Philippine war, which Congress never declared, began about the time the Spanish war closed, is still raging, and the end thereof is not even in sight.

One day we are informed by General Otis, our viceroy in Asia, that Aguinaldo is cornered and about to be captured at some distant point; the next day Aguinaldo is fighting within hearing of Manila.

This game of military hide and seek has been played for about a year, at a cost to the people of thousands of valuable American lives and of over one hundred millions in hard cash.

The mothers and fathers of the country who are called upon to sacrifice their sons, the overburdened taxpayers who foot the bills, are beginning to exclaim, “How long, O Lord, how long?”

When the Spanish war closed we could have occupied the most enviable position ever held by any nation since creation's dawn, and all we had to do was to do that which we owed it to ourselves to do, and that was to say to both the Cubans and the Filipinos, “The Spaniards are beaten; your chains are broken; you helped us to do this thing; now set up any sort of government you want, and we will make

the other nations of the earth keep their hands off of you or we will shoot them off." [Applause.]

We would never have been compelled to fire a gun to make that promise good, for there is not a nation on earth that has any desire to see the fleets of Dewey and of Schley riding triumphantly in their harbors and shelling their seaport cities.

Had we done that, unstinted praises of our disinterestedness and philanthropy would have rung round the world, coupled with the amazing story of American valor and the prowess of Americans in arms. Wherever Old Glory floated it would have been hailed by millions of loving hearts in every quarter of the globe as the emblem of a people who are free themselves and who are willing and anxious that all men everywhere shall be free.

Now, on the principle that a fellow-feeling makes the whole world kin, the crowned and sceptered despots of Europe say to us: "All hail! We welcome you to membership in the ancient and sordid society of land grabbers. As you are the youngest and the strongest, we will give you the largest, choicest, and juiciest slice in partitioning the face of the globe among ourselves. We are in high good humor with you because you have eschewed the pestiferous principles of the Declaration of Independence, the cobweb restrictions of the Constitution, the preposterous sentiments of Washington's Farewell Address, the decisions of the Supreme Court for a century, the presumptuous doctrine of James Monroe, and the solemn advice of Abraham Lincoln. Those men and those principles were well enough in a crude age and among a backwoods people, but this is the last year of the nineteenth century—if not the first of the twentieth—and we will go land hunting, gold hunting, diamond hunting, and man hunting together. As a special favor we will give you all the entangling alliances you want for the rest of your lives, beginning with the Anglo-American alliance."

It is with the greatest diffidence that I quote the Supreme Court of the United States or any judge thereof. My observation is that everyone admires the Supreme Court and adores it when it has decided his way; and when it decides against him, he reserves to himself the right to go out and "cuss" it. Very much depends on whose ox is gored.

The other day my distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], who sits in front of me and who honors me by his attention, put in a great deal of his time apotheosizing Judge Story, of the Supreme Court of the United States. I do not object to that. Judge Story deserves well at the hands of posterity. But I am going to quote you another judge of the Supreme Court of the United States—John Marshall—for nearly thirty-five years Chief Justice of the United States. I am not enamored of Marshall's politics; he was the rankest Federalist that ever lived; but this tribute is due to him—that he was the greatest jurist that ever sat on that bench; and Judge Story compared with Marshall "is as moonlight unto sunlight, or as water unto wine." Here is what Chief Justice Marshall says in one case:

The Government of the United States can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given or given by necessary implication.

Now, please bear in mind who John Marshall was. He was not only Chief Justice, but he was the chief of Federalists. He resolved every doubt in favor of the General Government. But those were his words, and surely Republicans ought to accept them as sufficient. Remember also that he is defining the powers and scope of the Federal Government under the Constitution. We are, or ought to be, at this very hour trying with all the lights before us to ascertain our powers and our rights in dealing with the Philippine Islands under the Constitution.

Again the Supreme Court says:

A power in the General Government to obtain and hold colonies as dependent Territories over which they (the Congress) might legislate without restriction would be inconsistent with its own existence in its present form.

Those be pertinent words.

Then in another case:

The power of Congress over the Territories is limited by the obvious purposes for which it was conferred; and those purposes are satisfied by measures which prepare the people of the Territories to become States of the Union.

I want to read that to you again, because upon that proposition turns this whole question. The serious question to us and our posterity is, What are we going to do with the Philippines if we get them? I have no doubt about our getting them if we want them, though we have not got them yet; but, as I stated once before upon the floor of this House, in fighting the annexation of the Sandwich Islands, this Government is strong enough to do what it pleases with the nations of the earth; and if we want to, we can take the islands; never fear about that.

But I want to read you that proposition again. This is a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, no Republican or "Goldbug" can afford to say that he is not going to be governed by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, because in 1896 you denounced us all over this land as anarchists because we proposed to do the very same thing that the Republican party has done with the Supreme Court of the United States: that was to reorganize it so that we could get the kind of decision out of it that we wanted. And as for myself, I unhesitatingly say that if I had the power I would reorganize it.

But I want to read the proposition again, for you are nearly all lawyers:

The power of Congress over the Territories is limited by the obvious purposes for which it was conferred; and those purposes are satisfied by measures which prepare the people of the Territories to become States of the Union.

Now, I want to submit this to you while you are cool, while this has not yet become a party question. It is becoming one; but it has not become one yet. Is any man on this floor willing to say that the Philippine Islands shall ever become States of the American Union? I challenge the array on the other side of the House individually for any man there to get up and state that he is in favor of making American States out of the Philippine Islands, either now or hereafter.

Now I will tell you what I think about the Filipinos. One of two things is true about them—either they are fit for self-government or they are not. If they are, in God's name let them govern themselves. If they are not, we do not want them as fellow-citizens.

I will tell you another thing I believe I know about them. No matter whether they are fit to govern themselves or not, they are not fit to govern us [applause], and that is precisely what they will do to let them in as States.

Now, let us see what the Supreme Court says a little further—it is mighty good reading when it is your way:

The Territories acquired by Congress, whether by deed of cession from the original States or by treaty with a foreign country, are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justify it, of being admitted into the Union as States, upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects.

There you have it. Now, the Philippine Islands have one of the two qualifications. They have the population. Nobody knows how many islands there are. There is not a man in the House or on the earth, except by accident, who can guess within five hundred of the number of the Philippine Islands. Even MARK HANNA can not do it, nor General GROSVENOR, who knows nearly everything. [Laughter.] There is not a man in the United States or on the face of the earth who can tell within 5,000,000 of the number of people there are in these islands. But if you take the lowest estimate, 8,000,000 people, how many States would that make in the American Union equal to the population of Nevada, which at the last election only cast about 9,000 votes and at the Presidential election 12,000? Why, it beggars the imagination to think of the number of almond-eyed, brown-skinned, Mohammedan United States Senators who would sit over there to kill the vote of Gen. FRANCIS MARION COCKRELL, senior and perpetual Senator from the State of Missouri, and those other illustrious conscript fathers.

Now, you gentlemen must look out for breakers. The truth is, the more you study it the less you are going to be in favor of taking those islands in at all. The more the American people think about it the less stomach they are going to have for having the liberties of their children impaired by people who go naked, sleep outdoors, and make their living by eating breadfruit off the trees.

Let us read some more: it is good when it is with you.

The Supreme Court says:

The Constitution was made for the benefit of every citizen of the United States, and there is no citizen, whatever his condition, or wherever he may be within the territory of the United States, who has not a right to its protection.

Now, our Ways and Means Committee—of course I would not say anything disrespectful of that august body, which contains several of the most distinguished statesmen in this House—that committee have been studying what? Politics? No. Finance? No. Political economy? No. Studying lexicography, to find out what constitutes the United States. I am not authorized to speak for that committee, but I understand that they are about to run foul of Brother McKinley's opinion in their definition of what constitutes the United States.

Let me read to you some more from the opinion of the United States Supreme Court:

The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories—

It does not help it to call them colonies, for that is a mere subterfuge: that is a

piece of legislative legerdemain to undertake to escape a great and grave responsibility to ourselves and our posterity by trying to hide behind the word "colony"—

The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories are secured to them as to other citizens by the principles of constitutional liberty, which restrain all agencies of the Government, State and national.

Oh, yes; but these statesmen say they are not going to let the Filipinos come over here. "No, bless your soul; they shall not come." No man who is fit to sit on the Supreme Bench or the circuit bench of the United States or the bench of a State court would tolerate that cheap demagogy for half a minute. Thank God that the American citizen, black or white, brown or copper colored, male or female, has the right, under the Stars and Stripes, to go wherever he pleases within the broad confines of this Republic without asking the consent of any power or getting a pass from the President of the United States. As quick as you make them American citizens, they can come here and drive our white men out of their positions into starvation; and really the men who are back of this propaganda are in favor of doing that very thing. I want to read you a little more. Here is what Judge Cooley says:

And when territory is acquired, the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom, and to receive them into the Union, must follow, of course.

Now, it will not do to say that Judge Cooley is "an old fool," not while the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] is an honored member of this House and while the Roberts case concerns the intelligence of mankind. Listen to Cooley again:

Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania.

And when territory is acquired, the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom, and to receive them into the Union, must follow, of course, not only because the Constitution confers the power to admit new States without restriction, but because it would be inconsistent with institutions founded on the fundamental idea of self-government that the Federal Government should retain territory under its imperial rule and deny the people the customary local institutions.

Gentlemen, if there ever was a legal proposition proved in this world by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, that string of decisions, and others which might be cited, demonstrate that we can not take the Philippine Islands unless we intend ultimately to make States out of them: unless you intend to go back to your old doctrine of 1855 and '6 and '7 and '8, and propose to reorganize the Supreme Court of the United States and pack it, as you did in 1855 and '9 to get the legal-tender decisions.

The proposition that we must support the President's Philippine policy—whatever that may be—right or wrong, is the veriest rot, an insult to intelligence, a shame upon manhood, a tale told by an idiot, a betrayal of the principle of self-government.

I am willing to go as far as anyone in patriotism. I will support the country in any emergency; but President McKinley is not the country. The time has not yet come—I pray Almighty God that it may never arise—when the American people will accept the arrogant dictum of Louis XIV, when repeated by an American President, "I am the State!"

If President McKinley is at all worthy of his high position, he must entertain a supreme contempt for those political invertebrates, particularly for those claiming to be Democrats, who, in order to catch the crumbs falling from their master's table [applause], go about saying, "The President is wrong in his Philippine policy, but we must support the President." Out upon such cringing sycophancy!

Suppose a case. Suppose that when George III undertook to force our forefathers to pay the stamp tax, Patrick Henry, instead of delivering that great lyric speech before the Virginia house of burgesses, which precipitated the Revolution and which still thrills the heart like strains of martial music, had risen in his place and, cooing gently as a sucking dove, had said, "His Most Gracious Majesty is wrong about this stamp tax, but we must, as loyal subjects, support him, right or wrong." And suppose Washington, Jefferson, Greene, Warren, Lee, Putnam, Hamilton, Franklin, and all that glorious host of warriors and statesmen had weakly agreed to that. What would we be to-day? Instead of being the strongest, the richest, the most beneficent Republic that the sun ever looked down upon, we would still be English colonies, ruled by British proconsuls, without any voice whatsoever in the Government under which we live.

Those immortal state builders had been reared on the pleasant fiction that "the King can do no wrong," but when he did do wrong they boldly and iconoclastically trampled that preposterous falsehood in the dust and, wresting a continent from

his iron grasp, made it the home of liberty and dedicated it to the twin propositions, "All men are created equal" and "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." There were men in the land in 1776. Are there only manikins now? I do not believe such a monstrous libel on 75,000,000 American citizens. George III did wrong. Our fathers fought and conquered him. William McKinley does wrong. We will oppose and overthrow him under the forms of law. [Applause.]

I wish to make another suggestion along this line of letting these Filipinos in here. Now, Mr. Chairman, this startling proposition presents itself. Ten millions of Asiatics, not one of whom is fit to be an American citizen or to be made an American citizen—because that is what they will do—and have all the rights and privileges of American citizens! They can live on 15 cents a day from habit as well as we can on a dollar a day. Under the tutelage of skillful American teachers they will soon be as competent to use American machinery as our own mechanics, and the result of the whole thing is that American laborers, white and black, are to be brought into competition with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia, which you gentlemen have talked about so long, without a single, solitary compensatory benefit from the theory of free trade.

Now, think about it on the grounds of humanity. We are told that we have commissioned ourselves as a lot of Don Quixotes to go forth into the world in quest of adventures, and that our duty is to carry the blessings of liberty and settled government to the ends of the earth. I deny it. Our duty is to attend to our own business, to secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity.

Now, let us see if we are fit to go into the political missionary business, and on this I challenge your attention. I am going to state facts that are within the common knowledge of all the people here. I ask you reformers over there, are we, the American people, in condition to go into the world as missionaries to carry the blessings of liberty and settled government to all other peoples? My friend from Pennsylvania quoted Scripture the other day, I understand—I was not here; I am sorry I was not—in favor of the imperial doctrine. Why, the devil quoted Scripture on a celebrated occasion in favor of his proposition. [Laughter.]

I will quote you a bit of Scripture that fits it like a glove: "Let every man set his own household in order before he goes to meddling with the households of other people." [Laughter.] Also, "Physician, heal thyself." What kind of a condition are we in to do missionary work? Let us see what we are doing right now. Hanging "niggers" in Mississippi, burning "niggers" in Kentucky, hanging Italians in Louisiana, a double-headed government in Kentucky, one governor assassinated and two living, two governments and two legislatures, and they can not hold a court in some parts of the State, my native State, without calling the militia. Out in Illinois one Sunday evening last summer they had a battle in which more men were killed—and by a strange concatenation of events every one of them had a black hide—more men were killed than at the battle of Palo Alto or Resaca de la Palma.

Out in Idaho the State is under martial law. Up in Maine, the home of civilization and patriotism and learning, last summer they mobbed two preachers, tarred and feathered them, and rode them on a rail because they preached the doctrine of Jesus Christ. [Laughter.] The Washington Post—I wish I had the editorial here—stated that they would have burned them, but the lucifers would not work well. [Laughter.] Thank God, the lucifers were out of fix, or in the closing days of the nineteenth century, in the State of Maine, we should have had two humble followers of the Saviour being burned alive because they preached the doctrine of the holy Nazarene.

Last summer a mob with fury in its eye, murder in its heart, and a rope in its hand, chased a colored man and brother through the woods in Connecticut, the land of steady habits, but whether they ever found him or not I don't know; he has never been heard of since. [Laughter.] What must the souls of Charles Sumner, Harriet Beecher Stowe, William Lloyd Garrison, and those distinguished philanthropists think of that, if they think at all amidst their present environments? [Laughter.] A year or two ago they hanged five men on one tree in one night in Indiana, and it was not a very good night for Judge Lynch, either.

Let us take another instance. All last summer the United States courts in this country were run overtime, and all of the judges were liable to be stricken down with nervous prostration, and what were they doing? Busy issuing injunctions at the command of the plutocrats of the land against men exercising the God-given right of earning their bread in the sweat of their faces.

Let us come east a little. If what John Wanamaker says about Matthew Stanley Quay is correct, Quay ought to be in the penitentiary the rest of his natural

life [laughter]; and if what he says is not true, Wanamaker is the greatest liar since the days of Ananias and Sapphira. [Laughter.] Perhaps they are both correct. [Laughter.] I will not undertake to decide such a delicate question of Republican morals and Republican etiquette. [Renewed laughter.] The city of Philadelphia, whence my distinguished friend, brother ADAMS, comes, has become so corrupt that, notwithstanding it had 100,000 Republican majority at the last election, it imported ballot-box stuffers and repeaters from the city of Washington merely from the force of habit. [Laughter.]

I have stated one reason assigned by the imperialists why we should go out carrying the blessings of liberty to the ends of the earth. Another class of them say, "It is Providence." I have heard a good many bad things unloaded on Providence, but I never heard anything as bad as that. To claim that this is the work of Providence reminds one of the old colored brother who said he had observed that when he prayed that Providence would send him a chicken he never got it; but when he prayed that Providence would send him to the chicken he usually got there. [Laughter.]

There was one candid land grabber. That was the immortal soldier and statesman, Frederick the Great. He took Silesia, to which his ancestors had some shadowy claim two hundred years before his day. Through the horrors of the seven years' war, in which he soundly thrashed the Russians, Austrians, and French combined, he resolutely held on to his prey. All Europe in arms could not tear Silesia from his iron grasp. When all was over and he stood forth victor over all his foes, in a state paper one of his ministers undertook to demonstrate that it was the will of God, whereupon candid, heroic Frederick growled, "Strike it out. Leave the name of God out of that. Say I did it."

Our land grabbers are not so courageous as Frederick. A good many of them beat about the bush; but some do not. Living out West has a tendency to increase and encourage independence of character.

Senator CARTER of Montana took a whack at this business not long ago. Here is what he said:

This is a practical age. We are going to deal with this question on the basis of dollars and cents. Neither religion nor sentiment will have much influence in determining the verdict. The great question will be, Will it pay? If we can show the country that it will, as I think we can, the American flag will never come down from the Philippines.

Mr. Chairman, when the Republican party was first organized it went forth to do battle against the entrenched powers of the land as the friend of humanity; and I do not believe that if Abraham Lincoln and the great coterie of men who gathered around him were here to-day they would be willing to write the dollar mark as the sign with which the American people shall conquer. [Applause.] "Will it pay?" Are you willing to fritter away the liberty of coming generations that a lot of jobbers may be permitted to rake in a few dollars in the Philippine Islands?

But take the matter as the Senator from Montana puts it—on the low and debasing standard of the almighty dollar—and let us see how we will come out. It is said that figures will not lie. Here they are: The appropriations for the Army, passed in the spring of 1898, just before the Cuban war began, were \$23,129,344.30. The other day we passed an urgent deficiency bill carrying \$17,602,032.61 for the Army. The regular appropriation bill for the Army carried \$75,247,811, making a total of \$122,849,843.61 for the Army alone. Deduct from that the appropriation for the fiscal year, made in the spring of 1898, under normal conditions, and you have \$99,720,499.31 left as the cost of this imperial policy up to the present time for the Army alone.

That is the price of the Philippine war to date, exclusive of the increased expenditures for the Navy, exclusive of the awful waste of human life and human health, and exclusive of the expense of a long roll of pensioners, which our children to the third and fourth generation will not live long enough to see paid.

What have we to show for this immense expenditure of life and blood and tears and treasure? Nothing, absolutely nothing.

When will this war end? Can anybody predict the day, even approximately?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I want to stir up your pure minds by way of a remembrance. We went into that Spanish war with the solemn resolution of Congress that it was not for imperial aggrandizement or to enlarge our territory. What did we do that for, do you suppose? Did we do it because we had nothing else to do? Was it just a mere empty flourish of rhetoric? No; I will tell you what we put it in there for. For two reasons. In the first place, you never would have gotten a resolution through this Congress declaring war in the world if it

had not been put in there, because there were enough of us here who dreaded this very thing to prevent it.

In the second place, we put it in there to secure the good opinion of mankind, to keep the old nations of the earth from getting scared at this lusty young giant of the West, and it did keep them off: and if anybody had had any idea that an attempt would have been made to confine that resolution to Cuba, it would have been put into that resolution so broad that it would have covered every foot of land on the face of God's footstool.

We are in a nice fix, are we not? There is one other gentleman about whom I wish to express my opinion. A man stood up in the Senate of the United States not long ago and held up before the twinkling eyes of the members of the House of the Ancients a piece of glittering gold that he alleged he had picked up in the Philippine Islands, and said, in substance, "There are mountains of it over there, and for that reason we should go and dispossess the people and take their land."

Mr. Chairman, the junior Senator from Colorado did not overstep the mark when he denounced that speech as "base and sordid," and I will give my opinion of it in another way. There is scarcely a convicted thief in any penitentiary of any civilized country on the globe who did not land behind the bars by reason of just such temptation as the gentleman of the Wabash held up before the Senate of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, they quoted Scripture here the other day. I want to quote a little myself. It is written, "Judge a tree by its fruits." That is good gospel. It was good sense before it was ever put in the Bible. What are the fruits of imperialism up to date? I am not going to overstate the case at all. In the first place, it has led us into abandoning the Declaration of Independence, which has made us what we are and glorified us in the eyes of the whole world. That is the first proposition.

Latter-day Republicans sneer at the Declaration of Independence as composed of glittering generalities and barren idealities, not fit to be considered seriously by fin de siècle statesmen. Any man that asserts that it really means something, that it is the major charta of our liberties, that it contains the argument not only for our Revolution but for all representative government, is rated by these practical statesmen as a sickly sentimentalist.

As if endowed with prophetic power to see what would be happening here in 1900, Mr. Lincoln, at Lewiston, Me., said, in 1858:

Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants; and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men, were entitled to liberty and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, * * * so that no man should thereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the principles on which the temple of liberty was being built.

Those words seem spoken to describe our imperialists, who sneer at the Declaration of Independence and its authors.

Republicans are fond of tracing their political pedigree to Alexander Hamilton, who condemned their present performances in these words:

National liberty is a gift of the beneficent Creator to the whole human race; and the civil liberty is founded on that, and can not be wrested from any people without the most manifest violation of justice.

Charles Sumner was once considered a great prophet in Republican Israel, and the popular voice endowed him with all the virtues of martyrdom. In an unguarded moment he said:

The words that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" are sacred words, full of life-giving energy. Not simply national independence was here proclaimed, but also the primal rights of all mankind.

His illustrious successor in the Senate, the learned and venerable GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, is now denounced as a traitor by cheap-john demagogues because he expresses sentiments similar to those of Sumner.

Sneer at the great Declaration and its self-evident truths, do you? Here are a few pearls of thought and patriotism culled at random from the archives of the Republican party in its better days:

Resolved, That the principle promulgated in the Declaration of Independence is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions.—*Republican platform of June 17, 1850.*

Resolved, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, that governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions.—*Republican platform of May 17, 1860.*

Resolved, This convention declares itself in sympathy with all oppressed people who are struggling for their rights. We recognize the great principles laid down in the immortal Declaration of Independence as the true foundation of democratic government, and we hail with gladness every effort toward making these principles a living reality on every inch of American soil.—*Republican platform of May 20, 1863.*

Resolved: That the Republican party has always been the champion of the oppressed and remained the friend of mankind, irrespective of faith, color, or nationality. It sympathizes with the cause of home rule in Ireland.—*Republican program of June 19, 1897.*

Really, some Anglo-Saxon ought to move to strike out sympathy for Ireland and insert sympathy for John Bull in the awful but righteous trouncing he is just now receiving at the hands of Oom Paul Kruger.

But, gentlemen, we do not have to confine ourselves to quotations from the dead statements and to musty platforms in the years ago. There is an eminent, I may say pre-eminent, Republican jingo statesman now living—not only living, but living in clover—who not long since publicly and solemnly gave in his adhesion to the doctrines of the Declaration and with prophetic power condemned the present Philippine policy of the Administration. His name is William McKinley. He resides in the White House. He hath office galore to distribute to the faithful. But in a moment of temporary aberration he blurted out these treasonable words:

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that, under our code of morals, would be criminal aggression.

Some supple-jack of a jingo ought to move to expunge those words from the records of the country and from human memory.

TESTIMONY OF A GREAT MISSOURIAN.

I will now quote a few pregnant sentences lately uttered by a great Missouri Republican, now a resident of Washington, Gen. John B. Henderson. I like to quote Republicans when they talk wisdom and patriotism. John B. Henderson is one of the greatest lawyers ever in either branch of Congress. He was a brigadier-general in the Union Army, a Senator of the United States for eight years, President of the convention which nominated Blaine, and president of the Pan-American Congress. He is the only man, living or dead, that ever refused a place on the supreme court bench of Missouri. He rendered his country and his party conspicuous service by having conscience, courage, brains, and patriotism enough to vote for the acquittal of Andrew Johnson, to prosecute the whisky ring even unto death, and to help defeat General Grant for a third term.

It will not do for gentlemen to sneer at General Henderson when he says:

For what purpose, then, are we conquering the Philippine people? And how are they to be governed when passed under the robe of "sovereignty"? These are the great questions which come to later we must solve for ourselves, and which the Philippine people have propounded to our rulers, beginning with the President and going down to the captains of companies, whose only reply has been to mow them down by thousands with the destructive arms of modern science. Shall these people be citizens of the United States, free to come and go from State to State? Shall they be governed by local legislatures of their own election, represented in the Federal Congress and clothed with all the rights of American Government? Tell down this and the war will close in an hour. Will you tell them less to deny the theory of our own Government, to subvert the foundations of American liberty, and to enter upon a system of imperialism as fatal and as overwhelming to the governing power as is personal slavery to the master.

From these people we have concealed the records of our political history. We hide from ourselves, as we hide from them, the political interpretations of our own Constitution, and tell them with solemn faces that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution itself are but glittering generalities intended for the ear and not for the work.

EVIDENCE OF AN EMINENT REPUBLICAN STATESMAN.

I now quote from a man who is admired and beloved by all friends of liberty, wherever domiciled. His name is Carl Schurz. "To name him is to praise him." Born in Germany, he was one of that band of noble revolutionists who in 1848 strove heroically to make Europe free. He came to this country to find here that liberty which was unattainable there. The friend and confidant of Lincoln, he became a major-general, minister to Spain, Senator of the United States from Missouri, and Secretary of the Interior. He is universally recognized as a man of conscience, of courage, of brains, of learning, and of eloquence. At the age of three-score and ten he is still a great tribune of the people and an active friend of human freedom. I commend his words of wisdom to all who hear or read this speech. In speaking of the possibility of new States from our newly acquired territory, he says:

In Puerto Rico, for instance, politicians of lively ambition are already clamoring for the speedy organization of that island as a regular Territory, soon to be admitted as a State of the Union. You may say that they will have long to wait. Be not so sure of that. Consult your own experience. Has not more than one Territory, hardly fitted for statehood, been precipitated into the Union as a State when the majority party in Congress thought that by doing so its party strength could be augmented in the Senate and in the House and in the electoral college? Have our parties become so unfaithfully virtuous that this may not happen again? So we may see Puerto Rico admitted before we have had time to rub our eyes.

You may say that little Puerto Rico would not matter much. But can any clear-thinking man believe that when we are once fairly started in the course of indiscriminate expansion we shall stop there? Will not the same reasons which induced us to take Puerto Rico also be used to show that the two islands of Santo Domingo, with Haiti and of Cuba, which separate Puerto

Rico from our coast, would, if they were in foreign hands, be a danger to us, and that we must take them? Nothing could be more plausible. Why, the necessity of annexing Santo Domingo is already freely discussed, and agencies to bring this about are actually at work. And as to Cuba, every expansionist will tell you that it is only a matter of time. And does anyone believe that those islands, if annexed, will not become States of this Union? That would give us at least three, perhaps four, new States, with about 3,500,000 inhabitants—Spanish and French Creoles and negroes—with six or eight Senators and from fifteen to twenty Representatives in Congress, and a corresponding number of votes in the electoral college.

Another thing. Name the Constitution to one of these imperialists, and what answer do you get? Why, Gen. Wesley Merritt blurted out, what most of you were thinking, that “the Constitution was played out, it was not even worth discussing.”

They sneer at Washington’s Farewell Address, that everybody, including Mr. McKinley himself, has acknowledged as containing the wisdom of the world. Abandon the Monroe doctrine—that is what imperialism means—at once and without a struggle; because it stands to reason and to nature that we can not play the dog in the manger on this continent and at the same time colonize in the Eastern Hemisphere. Let us take another thing which has been done and which has been applauded by the public conscience. The other day, with a ground swell of virtue, this House rose in its might and took Brigham H. Roberts by the nape of the neck and slack of the trousers and set him out in the cold, cold world. [Laughter.]

Now, why, gentlemen? Because he had three wives; but the real argument against Roberts was never stated on this floor, and that was that it invaded the Democratic doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. [Renewed laughter.] But we performed that very virtuous act when we put him out because he had three wives, although Brigham H. Roberts was a Democrat. Now, this Republican Administration goes into an agreement or treaty—I do not care what they call it, but some kind of a paper—by which it takes into the employment of the United States Government that eminent Republican officeholder, the Sultan of Sulu, who has 300 wives. [Laughter.] Now, we Democrats, we virtuous Democrats—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And we pay him tribute.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I will tell you about that in a few moments. We virtuous Democrats joined with you virtuous Republicans and put out of this House a polygamous Democrat. Now, as one good turn deserves another, I ask you virtuous Republicans to join hands with us virtuous Democrats and not admit within the American Union that eminent Republican officeholder, the Sultan of Sulu. [Laughter.] What are you doing? You are paying him \$250 a month and you are paying his dato, Murah Jara, \$75 a month. What are the duties of Murah Jara? Why, he is the keeper of the Sultan’s harem [laughter]; and if you go on with this thing no Republican statesman will be properly equipped for a seat in the American Congress unless he has a harem and a keeper of his harem. [Great laughter.] I believe in having one wife, and I never saw what anybody wanted with more, and I am teetotally opposed to me or my people helping pay a part of the salary of the keeper of anybody’s harem.

Let us see another thing about it, because it is all here. What are we doing now? Paying tribute to a petty tyrant. That is the plain fact. You can not wriggle out of it; that is what it is—paying tribute to a petty despot for the privilege of running the American flag up on the strawstack he inhabits as his palace. [Great laughter.] When did an American President ever pay tribute before? I will tell you. George Washington had to, because he could not help it. John Adams did it for the same reason; but when Thomas Jefferson came in, the only red-headed President of the United States [laughter and applause]—and in that connection, if the color of a man’s hair has anything to do with it, it is high time that another red-headed man should become President [renewed laughter]—he refused to pay tribute to the Barbary pirates, and ordered a Democratic lieutenant of the United States Navy to shell them out of their holes, which he did, and that was the end of the United States paying tribute at the Straits of Gibraltar or anywhere else.

Now, in the closing year of the nineteenth century, if not the first of the twentieth, the President of the United States, the President of 75,000,000 of people, pledged himself to pay this tribute to a petty despot whose very name you do not know. How do they justify it? Why, President Schurman has admitted in his declaration that it includes slavery and polygamy both. Schurman made defense of it. What reason do you think he gave? He said, “They tolerated slavery and they tolerated polygamy because these things were a part of their religion.”

Now, my brothers, did not Brigham H. Roberts stand in this very House and justify his position on the ground that it was a part of his religion? Did he not? What else did Schurman say? He said the kind of slavery they have over there

is a very mild form, a sort of patriarchal institution. Did you ever hear that kind of talk before? You young men never did, but the older men here know that that was precisely the defense that the people of twelve or thirteen States of the American Union made, that African slavery was a mild form, a sort of patriarchal institution. We are coming to it again.

Now, I want somebody to answer this question. If polygamy is wrong in the United States, is it right in Asia? Is it? The last Democratic President of the United States, James Buchanan, sent an army to thrash the Mormons in Utah. The latest Republican President of the United States, and, let us hope, the last, enters into some kind of an agreement—they say it is not a treaty—with a polygamist of the Sulu Islands. I submit that if Brigham Young was a criminal for having 26 wives, the Sultan of Sulu is a greater criminal for having 300 wives. [Laughter.] Did you ever hear of the question of slavery and what it did? For four long years it made this country red with the best blood of the nation because some people thought other people should not buy and sell human flesh. But I submit that what is wrong in America is not right in Asia. And if it is wrong for an American citizen to own a black African, it is wrong for anybody to own a brown Asiatic.

Now, one other thing. How do you like this paying of tribute? I do not believe you people like it any better than I do. Do you know what was the first infallible sign of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire? It was paying tribute to barbarians. Armies destroyed might be replaced, cities razed might be rebuilt, but when the lusty barbarian got the first taste of Roman tribute he never stopped until his whiskered pandours and fierce hussars rode through the vine-clad hills of Italy and fed their horses in the temples of the Roman of the seven-hilled city.

Let us see another thing that this imperialism has brought us to—a press censorship. These are the fruits of the tree of forbidden knowledge. A press censorship! Do you know what was the only party that ever established a press censorship in this country? It was the old Federalist party. It passed a law making it a crime to speak disrespectfully of the President of the United States, or of the Vice-President, or of the Supreme Court, or of the Senate or House of Representatives, or any member thereof. Good heavens! Just think of it! Suppose that law had been on the statute book during the last two years of Cleveland's last Administration; where would we have been? Every man Jack of us would have been in prison and not one would have escaped. [Laughter.] Yes, on both sides of the House. [Laughter.] Suppose that was the law now; where would a good many of us be? In durance vile.

But in 1800 the American people arose in their wrath and might and hurled the old Federalist party from power and buried it in a grave upon which there is inscribed, "No resurrection;" and if the Republican party in the United States persists in this press censorship it will follow the old Federalist party in the broad and dusty pathway to oblivion.

Another bitter fruit of the tree of imperialism is that it makes our Government callous to the Macedonian cry which comes to us from other peoples who are fighting for the right to govern themselves.

The love of freedom is not confined to any latitude or longitude.

Wherever people are struggling for liberty they should have the friendship of all Americans.

It is astounding that there should be any argument as to that proposition within the broad confines of this puissant Republic. Two years ago there would not have been; but a change, a marvelous change, has come over the spirit of our dream.

In the elder day we would have made the welkin ring; now, governmentally speaking, we are dumb as oysters. Wherefore? Because England is a robber nation; we are ambitious to become a robber nation; and all robber nations must stand together for self-protection; and because it is so English, don't you know!

That's official America, mark you—only official America.

From its sordid and inhuman verdict we appeal to the unofficial masses, who make and unmake statesmen, the great body of our citizenship, whom Abraham Lincoln affectionately denominated "the plain people"—yes, the plain people, the honest people, the uncorrupted people, who do not covet their neighbor's land, whose eyes are not blinded by the sheen of their neighbor's gold, whose cupidity is not excited by the sparkle of their neighbor's diamonds, who do not believe that larceny, burglary, arson, and murder are fundamentals of political economy, and in whose pure and tender hearts the sweet song of human freedom is forever singing.

The Senate of the United States may laugh to scorn Senator MASON'S resolution of sympathy with the Boers, but the toiling millions of America will send their

sympathy and their hearty Godspeed across the sea to the brave burghers who are the best marksmen seen on earth since Andrew Jackson's immortal day at New Orleans.

Why should we not sympathize with these sturdy defenders of their liberty, their homes, their wives, and their little children? They are in the right. Not only that—they have five times as much cause for fighting as our fathers had in 1775.

Daniel Webster once declared that our Revolutionary sires went to war about a preamble; but if that be true, it is also true that the essence of that preamble was the right of self-government, for which the Boers are fighting.

Twice they have abandoned their humble homes and removed into the wilderness to get rid of the English; but the villain still pursues them.

Why should we not express our sympathy?

The precedents all favor such action.

We passed resolutions of sympathy with the Greeks, when struggling heroically to break the yoke of the unspeakable Turk, and in advocacy of those resolutions Daniel Webster established his fame as an orator by his lofty and impassioned appeal to the moral sentiment of the world—the same sentiment which we now invoke in behalf of an oppressed and long-suffering people.

Under the lead of that matchless Kentuckian, Henry Clay, we hastened to express our sympathy with the nascent South American republics, thereby assisting them to throw off their Spanish chains; and we did our duty by that act.

We did these things when we were a feeble folk.

Then we were willing to defy the world, the flesh, and the devil to aid anybody anywhere struggling for freedom.

Now that we are so strong that we can not estimate our strength, we have fallen to the low estate of being John Bull's silent partner in butchering and despoiling white men—flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone—fighting valiantly and gloriously for their altars and their fires. Shame upon such a craven spirit!

If gold and diamonds had never been discovered in grand old Paul Kruger's bailiwick, there would have been no war. It is the Boers' gold and diamonds that the English are fighting for, and not the rights of the Uitlanders. Any weak people discovering gold, diamonds, or anything of value may expect a visit from Mr. Bull.

I hope he will get his fill of gold. I hope it from the bottom of my heart. I want him to get it as Crassus got it.

He waged a war against the Parthians to gobble their gold. They defeated his legions, cut off his head, poured melted gold down his dead throat, and, in derision, said: "Now, Crassus, thou hast thy gold!"

So may it be with Johnny Bull in South Africa and to all who are the foes of human liberty.

I do not want to worry the House, but there is another branch of this matter I want to mention briefly. This appetite for islands grows with what it feeds on. When we took in the Sandwich Islands I said then it was only the beginning of the end.

Now we have the Sandwich Islands; we have the island of Guam; we have Puerto Rico; we intend to swallow Cuba at the first opportunity; we are reaching out for the Philippines. One day two weeks ago the Philadelphia Inquirer had an editorial advocating the purchase by the United States of the Danish West India Islands—St. John, St. Croix, and St. Thomas. The very same day the Philadelphia North American had an editorial advocating the proposition that we buy the Galapagos Islands. Now, I undertake to say, unless you have rubbed up your geography lately, there is not a man in the House who would know which way to start—north, south, east, or west—if required to start instantly for the Galapagos Islands.

One other proposition. They say that where the American flag has once been raised it shall never be hauled down. The President of the United States said that. My friend from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, is the originator of that idea. A more preposterous one was never hatched in the brain of man. I do not believe that the President had any more intention of making that speech when he started South than I have of undertaking to fly. But he got down there among the Southern people; they are warm-hearted, hospitable, generous, enthusiastic, feather-headed, and they sometimes boil over. [Laughter.] When he got down there, with his engaging personality and handsome presence, it was such a relief from Cleveland that they went wild in their enthusiasm; and, as the newspapers stated, he interpolated that clause into his written speech at the banquet when it was past midnight—"Who shall haul down the American flag? Men of Dixie, will

you haul it down?" Of course they swore by the horns of the altar that they would not haul it down. [Laughter.]

There used to be a man named Napoleon Bonaparte, who roamed around a good deal away from home. [Laughter.] He may be called the most masterful flag raiser of that age. He ran up the French flag on every capital of Europe except London, and I have always been sorry he did not run it up there. Did he always keep his flag up where he first put it? Why, bless your souls, no. He pulled it down at Berlin, at Vienna, at Madrid, and—I was about to say a thousand other places. He took the French eagles back to their eyrie on the banks of the Seine. If my friend General GROSVENOR had been there he would have said, "Sire, you will sully your reputation. Where the French flag has once waved it must wave—

"Forever and forever,
As long as the river flows,
As long as the heart has passions,
As long as life hath woes."

And when Victoria, Louis Napoleon, and the Sultan of Turkey went into the Crimean war Queen Vic got into rather bad company on both sides. They ran up their flag on Russian soil. Did they keep it there? No; they pulled it down, and were glad to have an opportunity to pull it down and go home. If they had not done so Kinglake's history of the Crimean war would have contained so many volumes that the world would not have held them.

Does England always keep her flag up where she has hoisted it? She had floated it over every capital of Europe except that of Russia. She once floated it over the Philippines, but pulled it down again. On a day that no American can remember except with shame the British burned this Capitol, and over its ruins ran up the cross of St. George. Did they keep it there? No. If they had undertaken to keep it there, what would have happened? Why, every boy and half the girls born in the United States since that time would have died in the attempt to haul down that hateful rag.

Let us recur to our own history. Have we always kept our flag where we ran it up? Why, sir, we ran it up on the river Thames, in Canada. One of my kinsmen died on that battlefield running up that flag. We ran up our flag over the halls of the Montezumas, in Mexico; we ran it up on the walls of the Barbary powers, in Africa. Did we keep it up? No; when it had answered the purposes for which it was put up we pulled it down and brought it back into our own country, and have been stronger and better ever since for doing so.

Let me tell you something further about running up the flag and hauling it down. To say that you will never haul down the flag from any place where it has once been hoisted, means a war of extermination inevitably.

When John A. Dix at the beginning of the civil war telegraphed, "If any man undertakes to haul down the American flag, shoot him on the spot," it fired the patriotic heart of the land, because that flag was floating where it ought to float. But whenever you run it up where it has got no business, it ceases to be the banner of the free and the emblem of liberty and becomes to the people where it is run up an emblem of slavery and humiliation.

Now, gentlemen, I must stop, of course. I have exceeded now what I ought to have said. But one other thing I want to suggest to you. It is not pleasant to play the rôle of Cassandra, but people ought to learn by experience.

Why will we learn nothing from the sad fate of those who have gone before? I had an uncle somewhat given to wild ways. My father, an older man, advised him to profit by the experience of others. "Oh," replied the ardent youth, "I want to experience these things myself." We are acting in precisely the same reckless manner. Strong beyond computation, happier than any other people on earth, growing by leaps and bounds, yet with the history of the world for six thousand years before our faces we are hastening with flying feet into that broad and easy pathway which leadeth to destruction.

Take a few from the innumerable examples which history furnishes for our instruction—examples authenticated beyond all cavil.

Greece was the first great nation of Europe. As long as she was contented to remain within the bounds which nature fixed for her she flourished, the home of art, poetry, learning, commerce, and valor. But Greece was not big enough for Alexander, who, not satisfied with being the son of Philip of Macedonia, boasted that he was Amon's son. So he started out to slaughter, to conquer, and to seek universal dominion. We certainly can not hope to beat him at his own game. You know what befell him. But where be the cities now which he founded? Where the empire which he created; the glory of his own country, which he debauched, ruined, and enslaved?

Then Rome arose upon the banks of the yellow Tiber; waxed strong, expanded till Rome was synonymous with the civilized world; lorded it over all creation for some centuries; broke to pieces of her own weight and own rottenness; became the prey of the lusty barbarian and followed Greece to the graveyard of nations.

“In the second century of the Christian Era the Empire of Rome comprehended the fairest part of the earth and the most civilized portion of mankind. The frontiers of that extensive monarchy were guarded by ancient renown and disciplined valor.” Those are the splendid sentences with which Edward Gibbon opens *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, the saddest story in the annals of the human race. Dull indeed must be the man, cold must be his heart, whose imagination, fired by those two glowing and gorgeous sentences, does not conjure up for his contemplation magnificent pictures of human happiness and human prosperity. But, alas! the six large volumes which he wrote are almost exclusively devoted to giving a melancholy, a heart-rending history of human folly, human depravity, human weakness, human misery, and human poltroonery, such as can be found nowhere else in the entire realm of literature.

Here and there a flash of genius, an act of patriotism, a deed of humanity, a feat of heroism, lights up the somber scene of desolation and woe—only the last flickerings of the expiring candle. Constantly, forever downward, the great historian leads our steps, through suffering and decay, from the accession of Augustus Cæsar to the fall of Constantinople—scenes twelve hundred years apart, but welded together for our instruction and our warning. The end may be described succinctly as “Darkness everywhere; chaos come again.”

I wish most fervently that every citizen of this Republic could be compelled to read carefully and prayerfully Gibbon's stupendous work. It would wound the jingoes past all surgery, give the coup de grâce to imperialism on this continent, and save our children from a fate at the contemplation of whose horrors even the bravest of us must shudder.

Over and over and over again he tells us with an emphasis which can never be forgotten that “the decline and fall of the Roman Empire” was caused by the failure of the successors of Augustus to follow the sage advice of that crafty statesman to keep the empire within safe, reasonable, and natural bounds. With their evil example and its awful consequences before our eyes, we seem determined to plunge headlong into the black and bottomless abyss in which they disappeared forever from human ken.

At the astounding historic pageant at Brussels, when Charles V, weary of glory, of power, of conquest, and of the world, abdicated in favor of Philip II, he could with perfect truth have made the proud boast which Daniel Webster made for England, that the sun never set upon his dominions and that his morning drum-beat encircled the globe. Not only Spain was his, but also Italy, Sicily, Austria, the Netherlands, the Floridas, most of North, Central, and South America, and nearly all the islands of all the seas. Even the great highway of the ocean was denominated the Spanish Main. But his immense and glittering empire was an unnatural, an incongruous, an incoherent, an incompatible conglomeration of states, and only last year we, who as a nation were in our swaddling clothes when that great Emperor doffed his crown and betook him to a monastery, gave the finish to his abnormal empire.

Then came Louis XIV, the Grand Monarque, who was King for seventy-two years; who for half a century did bestride this narrow world like a Colossus; who, in the plenitude of his power, dreamed that he could defy the immutable laws of nature and by a family compact could give the earth and the fullness thereof in fee simple to his descendants; whose old age was made bitter by Blenheim, Oudenarde, Ramillies, and Malplaquet, by the loss of armies, battles, and provinces; whose cup of humiliation was filled to overflowing by the invasion of La Belle France; whose grandson died upon the block, and whose heirs are mere phantom kings—wanderers and vagabonds upon the face of the earth.

Close upon his august heels came the marvelous Corsican, the wonderful warrior, the self-styled “Armed Soldier of Democracy,” who boasted that he found the crown of France in the gutter, picked it up on the point of his sword, and with his own hands clapped it upon his head. Had he been warned by the fate of his predecessors, he would have died upon the throne, left it to his son, and in history would have been named “Napoleon the Invincible.” Not so, however. Filled with the vain lust of universal dominion, he, too, caught the fatal mania of imperialism. He conquered kingdoms, empires, and principalities. He deposed kings and queens until Europe was full of fleeing royalties. He made queens of his sisters, kings of his brothers, brothers-in-law, and even of his stable boys. In his vainglory he called his baby heir by the high-sounding title of King of Rome;

but in an evil hour for him—a blessed hour for humanity—he, too, ran up against the inexorable law of nature; his legions perished in the snows of Russia, and at last, a prisoner on a tropic isle, he died in a delirium, shouting, “Tête d’armée!”

At last appeared John Bull as the great practitioner of the fatal theory of expansion. He gobbled North America, a portion of South America, a large slice of Asia, most of northern Africa, the majority of all the islands in the bosom of the multitudinous seas. John was the greatest imperialist of them all. He had a long and successful run. At last he butted his hard head against Spion Kop and lost his glory in the Modder River. Many men hope and more believe that John has reached his highest point and hastens now to his setting, and that in South Africa, at the hands of old Paul Kruger, he will reach his Waterloo.

Unless we are the veriest idiots upon whom God has showered his blessings, rich and manifold, we will profit by the awful example of these and others who have gone to ruin by the fatal process of imperialism.

Oh, yes; but they ask if Jefferson did not expand. Of course he did. I am not against expansion. I am to-day in favor of taking every foot of the British North American possessions. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Jefferson expanded, and I thank God that he was President in 1803, for if he had not been we never would have had the trans-Mississippi country. We needed it in our business. It was contiguous territory. It had nobody in it except the Indians, whom we intended to kill, and a few white people who wanted to come with us. That is the truth. We had to have the Floridas, because we did not want Spain with a foothold south of us and England with a foothold north of us. We had to acquire Texas—that was a part of the Louisiana purchase, too—because if we did not have it a foreign nation would come up to Missouri and Kansas. We wanted a frontier and we got it. But over yonder there is a people alien to us; 10,000 miles away from us. There are sixty of them to the square mile, and there are only twelve of us to the square mile here.

I am proud of being a native of Kentucky; prouder of being a Missourian by adoption; proudest of all of being an American citizen. I have made this speech because I wanted to contribute my mite to the preservation of representative government.

When I look into the faces of my little children my heart swells with ineffable pride to think that they are citizens of this mighty Republic, built not for a day but for all time, bottomed on eternal truth and right and justice, and destined under God to be the dominating influence through all the centuries yet to be.

And now may the God of our fathers, the God who inspired the tongue and heart of Patrick Henry, the God who guided the hand of Jefferson while he traced the greatest state paper in the scrolls of time, the God who sustained Washington and his starving men during seven years of awful war and gave them complete victory on the blood-stained heights of Yorktown—may He preserve this great Republic, the last hope of constitutional government on the face of the earth, from all its enemies, foreign and domestic, and from its unwise friends who would lure it into the path that certainly leadeth to destruction. [Applause on the Democratic side.]



Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2010

PreservationTechnologies

A WORLD LEADER IN COLLECTIONS PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive

Columbia, Tennessee 38406

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 744 620 0

